

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10 and 13-17 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In a response to the first Office Action, the applicant explained the differences between the present claims and the cited references. The applicant appreciates the specific responses provided in this Final Office Action (pages 5-6), but the applicant believes that the Examiner has not fully understood the key point of the applicant's previous arguments. The applicant addresses the Examiner's response below (the statements in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Final Office Action have been previously responded to).

First, the applicant previously argued that the Suzuki reference does not teach the element [1a] of claims 1 and 13, "polarized light at a reflecting plane of the reflection electrode is substantially circularly polarized light in any of wavelengths," and the element [1b] of claim 6, "polarized light at a reflecting plane of the reflection electrode is substantially linearly polarized light in any of wavelengths." In the Final Office Action the Examiner points out that the second embodiment in col. 12, lines 26-37 of Suzuki refers to the reflection of the incident light by the reflector electrode 307. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner missed the point of the applicant's argument: The applicant never disputed that Suzuki teaches a reflection type LCD (all illustrated embodiments are reflective type). What Suzuki does not teach is the polarization of the light at the reflecting plane of the reflection electrode being substantially circularly polarized. In the portion cited by the Examiner, Suzuki specifically states that the light entering the liquid crystal is circularly polarized (col. 12, lines 29-33). Because the liquid crystal will likely change the polarization, the light at the reflection electrode is not necessarily circularly polarized. The Suzuki reference focuses on optimizing the parameters of the polarization plate and the phase difference films. The embodiments described in the instant specification, on the other hand, focus on

optimizing the liquid crystal parameters (which affect the polarization at the reflecting plane) as well as the other optical parameters (see, e.g., pages 15-22 of the present application). While such optimization details are not a limitation of the present claims, appreciating this fact should help one understand the differences because the present claims and the teaching of Suzuki.

Second, the Examiner points out a statement in Itoh et al. that the teaching can be applied to reflection type LCD devices. The applicant acknowledges that Itoh generally teaches the use of Stokes parameters as an analytical tool, and that Itoh contains a general statement to the effect that his method can be used in other types of LCD devices. But the applicant submits that Itoh does not teach the claim element [2] “projections of Stokes parameter ( $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $S_3$ ) of light between the phase plate and the liquid crystal layer on an  $S_1$ - $S_2$  plane constitute a substantially linear line” in claims 1, 6 and 13. Itoh uses the Stokes parameter representation mainly to explain the wavelength dependency of polarized state of a light transmitted through a liquid crystal layer under various applied voltages (see cols. 4-6, brief description of the drawings). Itoh does not teach the specific polarization state of light between the phase plate and the liquid crystal layer as recited in the present claims. Thus, even if we assume that Itoh can be combined with Suzuki, Itoh and Suzuki still do not teach element [2] quoted above.

Third, with respect to Yagyu, the Examiner states that col. 5, lines 30-45 discloses a reflective type LCD. Even assuming Yagyu can be combined with Suzuki and Itoh, still Yagyu does not teach or suggest claim elements [1a], [1b] or [2] quoted above. Therefore Yagyu does not cure the defects of Suzuki and Itoh.

In summary, the applicant believes that Suzuki, Itoh and Yagyu, either taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “projections of Stokes parameter ( $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $S_3$ ) of light between the phase plate and the liquid crystal layer on an  $S_1$ - $S_2$  plane constitute a substantially linear line” or “polarized light at a reflecting plane of the reflection electrode is substantially linearly [or circularly] polarized light in any of wavelengths” as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 13.

Appl. No. 09/624,062

Attorney Docket No. 81940.0001

Amdt. Dated November 3, 2003

Customer No.: 26021

Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2003

Accordingly, these claims and their dependent claims are patentable over the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: November 3, 2003

By: 

Ying Chen

Registration No. 50,193

Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900

Los Angeles, California 90071

Phone: 213-337-6700

Fax: 213-337-6701